Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/368,354	BUCKLEY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Joseph R. Pokrzywa	2622

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) _Joseph R. Pokrzywa_.   (3)_____.

(2) _John Fitzpatrick_.   (4)_____.

Date of Interview: _30 December 2003_.

Type: a)☐ Telephonic   b)☐ Video Conference
          c)☒ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant   2)☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes   e)☒ No.
    If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: ___1___.

Identification of prior art discussed: _Accad (U.S. Patent Number 5,982,937)_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)☐ was not reached. h)☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _See Continuation Sheet_.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

12/30/03

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed the current invention and how it differs from the cited prior art. The examiner agrees that they are different, but the differences are not coming through in the claim language. Further discussed ways to clarify the claim language to distinguish the invention over accd.